UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|--------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/582,536 | 06/09/2006 | Toru Shoji | TAN-123 | 9992 |
| | 7590 09/28/200 COBERTS, LLP | EXAMINER | | |
| ATTORNEYS. | | WYSZOMIERSKI, GEORGE P | | |
| P.O. BOX 484 PRINCETON, NJ 08542-0484 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1793 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 09/28/2009 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | | |
|-----------------|--------------|--|--|
| 10/582,536 | SHOJI ET AL. | | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | | |
| | | | |

| | George P. Wyszomierski | 1793 | | | | |
|--|---|---|-------------------------------|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ears on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence add | ress | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 15 September 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. | | | | | | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apper for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods: | the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance | Appeal. To avoid abar ., or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or | hich places the (3) a Request | | | |
| a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date | of the final rejection. | | | | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(| ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE | date of the final rejectio | n. | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | | | | |
| NOTICE OF APPEAL 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | | | | |
| <u>AMENDMENTS</u> | | | | | | |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for | | | | | | |
| appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. | | | | | | |
| NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1 | 16 and 41.33(a)). | | | | | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | | | | | |
| 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | | | | | | |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1 and 3-20. | | be entered and an ex | planation of: | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | | | | |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea , and was not earlier presented. Se | l and/or appellant fails e 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1) | s to provide a). | | | |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | n of the status of the claims after er | itry is below or attache | ∍d. | | | |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet. | t does NOT place the application in | condition for allowand | ce because: | | | |
| 12. ☑ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s).13. ☐ Other: | (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). <u>(filed 9/1</u> | <u>5/2009)</u> | | | | |
| | /George Wyszomierski/ Primary Examiner | | | | | |

Art Unit 1793

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Proposed amendment would render claims 3 and 7, claims 4 and 8, and claims 5 and 11 identical.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

- A) As noted above, the proposed amendment will not be entered because to do so would cause certain claims to be identical in scope to each other.
 - B) The proposed amendment to claim 1 would overcome the rejection made under 35 USC 112 in the prior Office Action.
- C) The proposed amendment would NOT overcome the rejection based on prior art because much of Applicant's argument appears to be based on alleged distinctions between attritors (as claimed) and other ball mills (as used in the prior art). However, the distinctions pointed out by Applicant are based on what appears to be ad copy from a company that makes or sells attritors, and as such cannot reasonably be said to be an objective scientific comparison between processes involving attritors and those involving other types of mills..